REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview granted on November 7, 2008. Further to the results of the interview, Applicant submits this Amendment.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 9-11 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 22, and cancels claim 22. Further, Applicant cancels claim 21, and therefore claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 9-11 should be entered as they merely reflect the subject matter of the prior pending claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The rejection of claim 21 is moot, as claim 21 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 9-11, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sadiq et al. (U.S. Patent 6,032,153, hereinafter "Sadiq") in view of MySQL 5.0 Reference Manual (hereinafter "MySQL"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1-3 and 22

By way of background, in the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Sadiq allegedly teaches substantially all the features of claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner's position is based on the following assertions:

> The "item" can be seen as Sadiq's "object" or "shared object" (they appear to be used interchangeably)…As such, it appears that the object of Sadiq is equivalent to a record (or row) in a database while the attribute of the object is a column of data relating to the record/object (attributes are equivalent to columns by Sadiq, col. 4, lines 12-13.
>
> Sadiq, col. 4, lines 13-15 shows that an attribute of the object has a "value type" that "refers to the data type of the attribute (e.g., integer, real, Boolean, string, character" for the object. *See* Office Action, p. 3.

Accordingly, the Examiner asserts that the "object" or "shared object" of Sadiq allegedly corresponds to the claimed "item," the columns in a database of Sadiq allegedly correspond to the claimed "attributes," and the "value type" of Sadiq, which may be integer, real, Boolean, string, character, allegedly corresponds to the claimed "type of the item."

To this effect, in the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that column 2, lines 2 to 6, column 2, lines 24 to 28, and column 4, lines 12 to 15 of Sadiq allegedly teach "wherein the type of the item, which specifies a data structure of the item, comprises a combination of attributes associated with the item," as recited in previous claim 22 (now canceled) and now incorporated into claim 1. *See* Office Action, p. 12.

However, Sadiq neither teaches nor suggests "the type of the item, which specifies a data structure of the item, comprises a combination of attributes associated with the item." This is because Sadiq does not disclose that the value type of the object "specifies a data structure" of the object. Instead, the value type of the item, which may be integer, real, Boolean, string, character, merely indicates a type of data in the item. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the value type of the item indicates any sort of data arrangement, i.e., "data

structure" as would be understood by a person having ordinary skill in the art, of the object in Sadiq.

Further, Sadiq neither teaches nor suggests "the type of the item, which specifies a data structure of the item, comprises a combination of attributes associated with the item." This is because Sadiq does not disclose that the value type of the item is made up of, i.e. includes or "comprises," a combination columns in the database. Rather, as would be understood by a person having ordinary skill in the art and as the Examiner states, "[e]ach of the attribute value pairs in the data structure has a value…[t]hese are values for the objects that were updated…[that] correspond to a row in the relational legacy database…[a]s such, these values also have a value type/data type (e.g., integer, real, Boolean, string, character)." *See* Office Action, p. 4. That is to say, at best, Sadiq describes a hierarchy in which an item (row) is associated with attributes (columns) that have value types (e.g., integer, real, Boolean, string, character). However, there is no teaching or suggestion that a value type of an attribute of the item comprises a combination of attributes.

Accordingly, Sadiq fails to teach or suggest "the type of the item, which specifies a data structure of the item, comprises a combination of attributes associated with the item," as recited in claim 1.

MySQL is merely cited for teaching an ALTER TABLE command and also fails to teach such a feature. Therefore, even if Sadiq could have somehow been modified based on MySQL, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination of Sadiq and MySQL still fails to teach "the type of the item, which specifies a data structure of the item, comprises a combination

of attributes associated with the item," alone and in combination with the other features of claim 1. As a result, claim 1 and its dependent claims would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Sadiq and MySQL for at least these reasons.

Claims 9-11 and 15

Independent claims 9-11 recite features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1, and hence claims 9-11 and their dependent claims also would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Sadiq and MySQL for at least analogous reasons.

Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sadiq in view of MySQL 5.0 Reference Manual, and further in view of Seaman et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0093433, hereinafter "Seaman"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 20 depends on claims 1 and 11, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 1 and 11. Seaman is cited for teaching retrieving a portion of an insert statement. Even if Sadiq and MySQL could have somehow been modified based on Seaman, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 1 and 11, and hence claims 4 and 20, as discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Sadiq, MySQL, and Seaman would not have rendered claims 4 and 20 unpatentable for at least these reasons.

Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sadiq in view of MySQL 5.0 Reference Manual, and further in view of Wildermuth (U.S. Patent 5,950,188). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 5 and 19 depends on claims 1 and 11, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 1 and 11. Wildermuth is cited for teaching retrieving information that indicates access rights for a structured query language statement. Even if Sadiq and MySQL could have somehow been modified based on Wildermuth, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 1 and 11, and hence claims 5 and 19, as discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Sadiq, MySQL, and Wildermuth would not have rendered claims 5 and 19 unpatentable for at least these reasons.

Claims 6 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sadiq in view of MySQL 5.0 Reference Manual, and further in view of Reiner (U.S. Patent 6,219,676). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 6 and 12-14 depend on claims 1 and 11, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 1 and 11. Reiner is merely cited for teaching a timestamp. Even if Sadiq and MySQL could have somehow been modified based on Reiner, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 1 and 11, and hence claims 6 and 12-14, as discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Sadiq, MySQL, and Reiner would not have rendered claims 6 and 12-14 unpatentable for at least these reasons.

Claims 7, 8, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sadiq in view of MySQL 5.0 Reference Manual, and further in view of Reiner (U.S. Patent 5,702,806). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 7 and 8, and 16-18 depend on claims 1 and 11, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 1 and 11. Reiner is merely cited for teaching cursors. Even if Sadiq and

MySQL could have somehow been modified based on Reiner, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 1 and 11, and hence claims 7 and 8, and 16-18, as discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Sadiq, MySQL, and Reiner would not have rendered claims 7, 8, and 16-18 unpatentable for at least these reasons.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sadiq in view of MySQL 5.0 Reference Manual, and further in view of Hoang (U.S. Patent 5,761,657).

The rejection of claim 21 is moot, as claim 21 has been cancelled.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Christopher J. Bezak /

Christopher J. Bezak
Registration No. 63,241

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133
46159
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 15, 2008